UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,107	05/03/2006	Motonori Yamamoto	12810-00192-US1	3025
	7590 01/21/201 OVE LODGE & HUT	EXAMINER		
1875 EYE STR	EET, N.W.	FANG, SHANE		
SUITE 1100 WASHINGTO	N, DC 20006	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1766	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/21/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/567,107	YAMAMOTO ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
SHANE FANG	1766		

	SHANE FANG	1766	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>18 January 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance v	Appeal. To avoid abar i, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (the MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(final form).	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejectio	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extra under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sloset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of nortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wind AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be  (a) They raise new issues that would require further con  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	sideration and/or search (see NOT v); er form for appeal by materially rec	E below); ducing or simplifying th	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12			PTOL -324)
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ul>		npliant Amendment (i	10L-324).
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s).</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alled non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected:  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an ex	planation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but			
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	·		•
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fails e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/RANDY GULAKOWSKI/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1766			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: No claim amendment has been filed.

The applicant submitted certified translation of foreign priority (DE 10336387.4, filing date 08-2003) in attempt to antedate Ohnishi et al. (US20040152857, filing date 01-2004). Ohnishi was used a secondary reference to alleviate the deficiency of Warzelhan for failing to disclose the claimed copolymer of glycidyl (meth)acrylate and styrene. However, the claimed copolymer of glycidyl (meth)acrylate and styrene has not been found supported by the priority document. The priority document merely discloses the component iii as "capable of forming covalent bonds with component i and ii (1:13-15, claim 1)" and "maleic anhydride (17:5)". Therefore, applicants have fail to antedate Ohnishi et al.

The applicant acknowledged additional data covering claimed range is currently unavailable. Furthermore, applicants submitted Ecoflex 7011 corresponds to component i-1 of specification (16:19-31). This is not supported by the original specification, because Ecoflex 7011 is not described in the original specification. Note the examiner has argued the component of Ecoflex 7011 is unknown in the previously filed affidavit. Thus, the examiner asserts applicants' showing of unexpected result is insufficient.

Therefore, the previous 103 rejections of claims 1-7 and 9-20 over Warzelhan et al. in view of Ohnishi et al. have been maintained.